

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 1-19 and 34 are pending in the application. With this amendment, claims 1 and 34 have been amended.

Claims 1-7, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,906,243 ("Dravland") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,011,653 ("Imsangjan"). Claims 8-13, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Dravland in view of Imsangjan and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0151864 ("Otsubo"). Claims 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Dravland in view of Imsangjan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,843,056 ("Goode"). Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth below.

**Response to Rejection of Claim 1**

In the Response to Arguments Section of the Office Action, the Office states that "Applicants' argument that Imsangjan fails to disclose leg openings being of complementary shape, as defined in the specification," was unpersuasive because "the present specification does not provide a clear and explicit definition of the term 'complementary shape.'" (Office Action, page 2). In response, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the feature:

said concave edge portion of one of said leg openings and said convex edge portion of said one of said leg openings ***matching each other along their lines of curvature***, said concave edge portion of the other of said leg openings and said convex edge portion of said other of said leg openings ***matching each other along their lines of curvature*** . . . . (emphasis added).

In the Response to Arguments section, this language was indicated by the Office as being a clearer definition of the formation of the two sections. (Office Action, page 2). Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found, for example, in FIGS. 5 and 6. As illustrated in FIG. 5, an exemplary embodiment of the invention is shown as being cut along line C. The portions cut along line C become the front section 22 and the rear section 24. Thus, the concave recesses 50 and 54 of front section 22 and the convex projections 60 and 62 of rear section 24 which are formed match each other along their lines of curvature. No new matter has been added.

Therefore, for the reasons argued in the Office Action Response dated October 31, 2008, and in view of the amendment clarifying claim 1, Applicants submit that the combination of Dravland in view of Imsangjian does not render claim 1 obvious.

#### **Response to Rejection of Claim 34**

In the Response to Arguments Section of the Office Action, the Office states that "in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e. the concave and convex edge portions being formed from a single web of material cut into a single line) are not recited in the rejected claims(s)." (Office Action, page 3). The Office alleges that the "claim limitation requiring the concave edge portion and the convex edge portion be shaped from a single cut line does not require that the concave and the convex edge portions be formed from a single cut web cut along a single cut line." As such, the Office asserts that the claim is "sufficiently broad that it merely requires each of the concave and the convex edge portions to have a single, continuous contoured edge." (Office Action, page 3).

In view of the Office's comments, Applicants have amended independent claim 34 to include the feature:

said concave edge portion of one of said leg openings and said convex edge portion of said one of said leg openings ***being shaped from a single web cut along a single cut line*** . . . . (emphasis added).

By amending claim 34 as recited herein, Applicants submit that claim 34 is patentable over Dravland in view of Imsangjian. Support for the amendment to claim 34 can be found, for example, in the originally filed specification at page 16, lines 16-19, and as shown in FIG. 5. No new matter has been added.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the arguments made in the Office Action Response dated October 31, 2008 in view of the current amendment to claim 34. For at least those reasons, Applicants submit that the combination of Dravland in view of Imsangjian does not render claim 34 obvious.


Furthermore, for at least these reasons, claims 2-7, 16 and 17, which are dependent on independent claim 1, are also patentable over the Dravland and Imsangjian.

Moreover, the Office rejects claims 8-13, 18 and 19 as obvious over Dravland in view of Imsangjan and further in view of Otsubo, as well as claims 14 and 15 as obvious over Dravland in view of Imsangjan and further in view of Goode. Applicants respectfully submit that at least for the reasons noted above, claims 8-13, 14, 15, 18 and 19 are patentable over these cited references, but may be separately patentable for additional reasons as well. Moreover, Applicants submit that neither Otsubo nor Goode make up for the deficiencies of Dravland and Imsangjan.

### Conclusion

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending application is in condition for allowance. Notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Joshua L. Cohen, Reg. No.: 38,040  
James C. Abruzzo, Reg. No.: 55,890  
Attorneys for Applicants

JLC/JCA/snp

Dated: March 26, 2008

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 18-0350 for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted to: Commissioner for Patents on:

March 26, 2008

